

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 09/479,999  
Attorney Docket No. A7631

**REMARKS**

Pending claims 7-12 and 27-31 have been examined and are rejected. Specifically, claims 7-12 and 27-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,841 to Schumacher et al. (hereinafter “Schumacher”). Applicants traverse the rejections as follows.

The Examiner alleges that Schumacher teaches the operation of “generating a page of presentation material in response to a request for said first information . . .”, as recited in claim 7, by disclosing that in response to a button being selected by a user, a selected section in a web document is displayed, and the display does not contain the information of other sections of the document (*citing* Schumacher: col. 11, lines 11-27 and 55-65; and Figs. 2A, 9A, 10 and 12-13).

To the contrary, the use of tools/buttons for causing a particular section of a document to be displayed in a browser and for navigating through the sections of the document via an interface of the browser, as described in Schumacher, does not correspond to generating a page of presentation material in response to a request for first information. Instead of generating a page of presentation material as required by claim 1, Schumacher discloses only that the actual content of the document itself (*i.e.*, of the selected section thereof), having previously been created, is displayed in the format in which it was created (*see, e.g.*, Schumacher: Fig. 6, step 162).

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Schumacher fails to teach or suggest that “the page is generated based on the first presentation layout and includes said first information

and does not contain said second information”, as recited in claim 7. Schumacher discloses that an entire document is retrieved by the browser such that selected portions thereof may be selectively displayed by the browser (*see* Schumacher: Fig. 6, steps 162 and 172). Thus, in Schumacher, the document retrieved by the browser includes both first information and second information, even though only a portion of the entire document may be displayed at any given time.

Further still, claim 7 is directed to “a method for managing internet presentation materials in a single file format...”. It is respectfully submitted that Schumacher fails to teach or suggest the use of a single file. To the contrary, in Schumacher, additional files are used. For example, a mapping file is used to provide the linking of the document element names (in the document file) to the icons in yet another file that is used in an interface of the browser (Schumacher: col. 8, lines 18-21; and Fig. 6, step 164).

Additionally, the Examiner acknowledges that Schumacher fails to disclose the features of “defining, in a first portion of the file, a first variable equal to first information and a second variable equal to second information” (Office Action: page 3). The Examiner, however, alleges that it would have been obvious to modify Schumacher to include these features.

In particular, the Examiner alleges that Schumacher discloses performing pre-defined operations such that there is a correspondence between the selectors and the selected sections as well as the display of the selected sections (Office Action: page 4). According to the Examiner, since Schumacher describes operating via a computer system (Schumacher: col. 3, lines 22-61)

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 09/479,999  
Attorney Docket No. A7631

and since it was well known in programming (computer systems) to define variable for operations or functions, the Examiner jumps to the conclusion that it would have been obvious to modify Schumacher to define different variables for different selectors (Office Action: page 4).

To the contrary, there is no suggestion or motivation (absent impermissible hindsight) for defining variables for the different selectors of Schumacher. In Schumacher, there is a one-to-one correspondence, which does not vary, between the selectors and the sections of the document to which they correspond. As noted above, a map file is used to map the association of the selectors to their corresponding sections (Schumacher: col. 8, lines 18-21; Fig. 6, step 164; and Fig. 8).

Schumacher in no way relates to computer programming. Instead, Schumacher, relates to the selective displaying of the contents of a static document by user interaction with selectors. Thus, the use of variables in computer programming would not have suggested the Examiner's proposed modification of Schumacher to include the use of variables to define the selectors corresponding to fixed sections/subsections of the document to be displayed.

For at least the above exemplary reasons, claim 7 is patentable over the Examiner's proposed modification of Schumacher. Claims 11 and 27, which along with claim 7 are the only independent claims pending in the application, recite features similar to claim 7. Consequently, claims 11 and 27 are patentable over the Examiner's proposed modification of Schumacher based on a rationale analogous to that set forth above for claim 7.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 09/479,999  
Attorney Docket No. A7631

Claims 8-10, 12 and 28-31 depend from claims 7, 11 and 27, respectively. Consequently, claims 8-10, 12 and 28-31 are patentable over the Examiner's proposed modification of Schumacher at least by virtue of their dependency.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Billy Carter Raulerson  
Registration No. 52,156

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 2, 2004